

EXHIBIT 252

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 1

25 Job No. CS6657993

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 2

1 APPEARANCES

2 FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

3 Jonathan Wilkerson
4 LANIER LAW FIRM
5 10940 W. Sam Houston Parkway N.
6 Suite 100
7 Houston, TX 77064
7 713.659.5200
7 jonathan.wilkerson@lanierlawfirm.com

8 FOR THE DEFENDANT:

9 Gayle R. Klein
10 Xiaoxi Tu
11 FRESHFIELDS BRUCKHAUS DERINGER US LLP
12 3 World Trade Center
13 175 Greenwich Street, 51st Floor
14 New York, NY 10007
15 212.277.4000
16 gayle.klein@freshfields.com
17 xiaoxi.tu@freshfields.com

18 FOR THE STATE OF INDIANA:

19 Matthew Michaloski
20 OFFICE OF THE INDIANA ATTORNEY GENERAL
21 Fifth Floor
22 302 West Washington Street
23 Indianapolis, IN 46204
24 317.232.6201
25 matthew.michaloski@atg.in.gov

20 VIDEOGRAPHER:

21 Jason D'Angelo

22 ALSO PRESENT VIA ZOOM:

23 Marie Martin
24 John Olson
25 Monica Vela-Vick
David Scalia
Michael Weitzner

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 3

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION	
2		Page
3	DIRECT EXAMINATION	5
4	Questions by Gayle R. Klein	
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION	112
6	Questions by Jonathan Wilkerson	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 76

1 Q Civil penalties as a sovereign and as a parens
2 patriae?

3 A Correct.

4 Q And costs?

5 A That is correct.

6 Q That is the totality of the relief that Indiana
7 is seeking in this action; correct?

8 A Correct.

9 Q Did Indiana ever -- I'll ask it this way.
10 Indiana never initiated administrative
11 proceedings against Google for the conduct
12 alleged in the fourth amended complaint;
13 correct?

14 MR. WILKERSON: Objection. Form.

15 A Correct.

16 Q Indiana could have brought these claims against
17 Google in state court; correct?

18 MR. WILKERSON: Objection. Form.

19 A Well, certainly we could have brought the DTPA
20 claims in state court. I'm not sure whether the
21 antitrust claims could have been brought in
22 state court. I'm not sure about that
23 jurisdictional question.

24 Q Is Indiana seeking relief under Indiana state
25 law antitrust claims?

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 77

1 A For an injunctive relief, yes.

2 Q Those claims could have been brought in state
3 court; correct?

4 MR. WILKERSON: Objection. Form.

5 A Oh, the state antitrust claim? Sure.

6 Q With respect to the parens patriae claims, what
7 categories of people or entities is the state
8 seeking relief on behalf of?

9 A We'd probably include publishers, advertisers,
10 and end users.

11 Q As you sit here today, are you aware of a single
12 publisher in the State of Indiana that uses
13 Google ad tech products to sell display
14 advertising?

15 A Today I cannot identify a particular publisher
16 or advertiser. But my understanding is that
17 discovery is still open and that there may be
18 expert testimony on this issue.

19 Q Does the State of Indiana know how many in-state
20 publishers use Google ad tech products in
21 Indiana?

22 A I don't believe so.

23 Q What is the factual basis for the allegations by
24 the State of Indiana that Google's alleged
25 conducted harmed publishers in the state of

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 78

1 Indiana?

2 A We believe that the common set of facts which
3 Texas has testified to would apply to Indiana,
4 the same as any other state.

5 Q As you sit here today, can the State of Indiana
6 name a single advertiser in the State of Indiana
7 that uses Google ad tech products to sell
8 display advertising?

9 A I can't name a specific advertiser, but I would
10 just reiterate that with discovery still pending
11 and with expert testimony to come, there may be
12 some specific names. In a state of seven
13 million people, there's bound to be some
14 publishers and advertisers here.

15 Q Do you know how many publishers or advertisers
16 in the state -- scratch that, because I already
17 asked about publishers.

18 Do you know how many advertisers there are
19 in the state that use Google ad tech products?

20 A I do not know.

21 Q And when I say --

22 A Same comment about discovery and expert
23 witnesses.

24 Q And when I say "you," you understand I mean the
25 State of Indiana; correct?

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 79

1 A Of course.

2 Q Does the Office of the Attorney General of the
3 State of Indiana have the power to issue a civil
4 investigative demand?

5 A We do.

6 Q And has the Office of the Attorney General of
7 the State of Indiana issued any civil
8 investigative demands to any third parties
9 related to Google ad tech products or display
10 advertising?

11 A I don't believe so.

12 Q What about end users? How many end users are
13 there that the State of Indiana contends have
14 been harmed?

15 MR. WILKERSON: Objection. Form.

16 A I can't possibly come up with a number beyond
17 telling you that there's seven million people in
18 the state and a lot of them have computers,
19 myself included.

20 Q And how would you quantify any harm to somebody
21 sitting behind a computer, from the allegations
22 in this case?

23 MR. WILKERSON: Objection. Form.

24 A If they had a paywall from a publisher that they
25 would not have had but for Google's practices.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 80

1 If they had to pay a higher price for a paywall
2 but not for Google's practices. If they didn't
3 see as many ads as might give them better, I
4 guess, shopping experience.

5 I think there are a number of ways that end
6 users would be adversely affected.

7 Q A publisher sets its own price for its paywalls;
8 correct?

9 A Presumably based on its total costs, among other
10 things.

11 Q Do you know if there are any -- and I apologize
12 if I asked this question already.

13 Do you know if there are any ad tech
14 competitors in Indiana to Google's products?

15 MR. WILKERSON: Objection. Form.

16 A I don't know for a fact. I assume there are,
17 but I don't know that for a fact.

18 Q As you sit here today, is the State of Indiana
19 alleging harm to Google's competitors in the
20 state of Indiana?

21 A Well, certainly not in this lawsuit.

22 Q So the State of Indiana is not seeking any
23 remuneration for Google's competitors in the
24 state of Indiana by this lawsuit; correct?

25 MR. WILKERSON: Objection. Form.

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 115

1 STATE OF INDIANA)

) SS:

2 COUNTY OF HAMILTON)

3 I, Janine A. Ferren, a Notary Public in and
4 for the County of Hamilton, State of Indiana at
5 large, do hereby certify that STEVEN TATERKA, the
6 deponent herein, was by me first duly sworn to tell
7 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
8 truth in the aforementioned matter;

9 That the foregoing deposition was taken on
10 behalf of the Defendant, at the offices of Office
11 of the Attorney General, Indiana Government Center
12 South, Fifth Floor, Indianapolis, Marion County,
13 Indiana, on the 25th day of April 2024, commencing
14 at the hour of 1:09 p.m., pursuant to the Federal
15 Rules of Civil Procedure;

16 That said deposition was taken down
17 stenographically and transcribed under my
18 direction, and that the typewritten transcript is a
19 true record of the testimony given by the said
20 deponent; and thereafter presented to said deponent
21 for his signature;

22 That the parties were represented by their
23 counsel as aforementioned.

24 I do further certify that I am a disinterested
25 person in this cause of action; that I am not a

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 116

1 relative or attorney of any party, or otherwise
2 interested in the event of this action, and am not
3 in the employ of the attorneys for any party.

4 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
5 hand and affixed my notarial seal on this 26th
6 day of April 2024.

7
8 
9

10 Janine A. Ferren
11
12

13 Seal, Notary Public	My Commission Expires:
14 State of Indiana	April 22, 2024
15 Janine A. Ferren	County of Residence:
16 Commission No. NP0681591	Hamilton
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 118

1 The State Of Texas, Et Al. v. Google LLC
2 Steven Taterka (#6657993)

3 E R R A T A S H E E T

4 PAGE 33 LINE 14 CHANGE _____

5 The word "charter" should be "chartered" _____

6 REASON Transcription error _____

7 PAGE 85 LINE 16 CHANGE _____

8 The word "reserved" should be "reserve" _____

9 REASON Transcription error _____

10 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

11 _____

12 REASON _____

13 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

14 _____

15 REASON _____

16 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

17 _____

18 REASON _____

19 PAGE _____ LINE _____ CHANGE _____

20 _____

21 REASON _____

22 Steven Taterka

May 21, 2024

23 Steven Taterka

Date

24

25

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL

Page 119

1 The State Of Texas, Et Al. v. Google LLC

2 Steven Taterka (#6657993)

3 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEPONENT

4 I, Steven Taterka, do hereby declare that I
5 have read the foregoing transcript, I have made any
6 corrections, additions, or changes I deemed necessary as
7 noted above to be appended hereto, and that the same is
8 a true, correct and complete transcript of the testimony
9 given by me.

10

11

Steven Taterka

12

Steven Taterka

May 21, 2024

Date

13

*If notary is required

14

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS

15

_____ DAY OF _____, 20____.

16

17

18

19

NOTARY PUBLIC

20

21

22

23

24

25